

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,942	02/16/2001	Gregory M. Burgess	50037.28US01	4402
27488	7590	08/17/2004	EXAMINER	
MICROSOFT CORPORATION C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C. P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/785,942

Applicant(s)

BURGESS, GREGORY M.

Examiner

Mohammad A Siddiqi

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07/02/2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 are presented for the examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Multer et al. (6,694,336) (hereinafter Multer) in view of "CDO & MAPI Programming with Visual Basic" published by Dave Grudgeiger, October 2000 (hereinafter Dave)

4. As per claims 1, 10, and 15, Multer discloses a computer-readable medium on a mobile computing device having computer-executable components for managing a message within a mobile device (col 5, lines 1-20, col 10, lines 1-13), comprising:

a main application in communication with at least one messaging component and a table (Outlook, col 11, lines 39-57 and col 13, lines 35-40, col 41, lines 40-41, col 19, lines 24-30), the at least one messaging component being configured to pass properties of the message to the main application using a standard interface (col 17, lines 25-63) the properties including a class identifier associated with the message (col 20, lines 55-67, col 26-27),

Multer is silent about the main application being further configured to pass the message the registered message form, the main application being further configured to pass the message the registered message form.

However, Dave discloses the main application being further configured to query the table to identify a message form registered to handle messages associated with the class identifier (chapter 2, pages 2-10, 27), the main application being further configured to pass the message the registered message form (chapter 2, pages 2-10, 27).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine to Multer with Dave because it would provide Messaging technology human to communicate more effectively with each other using handheld devices.

5. As per claim 2, Multer discloses the at least one messaging component comprises a message transport (col 16, lines 27-29).

6. As per claim 3, Multer discloses the at least one messaging component comprises a storage component (fig 8-10, col 11, lines 58-65, col 13, lines 35-40).
7. As per claim 4, Multer discloses another messaging component that communicates with the at least one messaging component and the main application using the standard interface (API's and COM, col 16, lines 48-67).
8. As per claim 5, Multer discloses the class identifier distinguishes the message from other messages (col 17, lines 25-67, col 18, lines 1-67).
9. As per claim 6, Multer discloses the class identifier is one identifier in a plurality of hierarchically structured class identifiers (Children object, col 18, lines 25-31).
10. As per claims 7 and 13, Multer discloses the table includes a listing of class identifiers that each describe a class of message (col 20, lines 55-67, col 26-27), each class identifier being associated with a corresponding message form (col 27, col 41, lines 40-41, col 19, lines 24-30).

11. As per claims 8 and 14, Multer discloses the table further includes a default message form that is returned when the class identifier is not in the listing of class identifiers (IErrorMsgcol 20-21).

12. As per claim 9, Multer discloses wherein the table comprises a system registration database (col 19, lines 24-30).

13. As per claim 11, Multer discloses the notice to handle the message comprises an instruction to display the message on the mobile computing device (fig 8, col 12, lines 28-65).

14. as per claim 12, wherein the class identifier is stored within a property of the message.

Dave discloses class identifier is stored within a property of the message (chapter 2 and 6-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine to Multer with Dave because it would provide Messaging technology human to communicate more effectively with each other using handheld devices.

15. As per claim 16, Multer discloses the first standardized interface includes means for instructing the message form object to perform actions (col 19, 24-47).

16. As per claim 17, Multer fails to discloses the first standardized interface comprises an IMessageForm interface (Outlook display data in form format must be done using similar interface, col 15, lines 29-40, col 19-22).

17. As per claim 18, Multer discloses the first standardized interface comprises an IFormProvider interface (Outlook display data in form format must be done using similar interface, col 15, lines 29-40, col 19-22).

18. As per claim 19, Multer discloses the second standardized interface includes means for instructing the application to perform actions (Methods in the classes performs action, col 15, lines 29-40, col 19-22).

19. As per claim 20, Multer discloses the second standardized interface comprises an IMessageFormHost interface (col 15, lines 29-40, col 19-22).

20. As per claim 21, Multer discloses the second standardized interface comprises an IMailSyncCallBack interface (col 15, lines 29-40, col 19-22).

As per claim 22, Multer discloses the third standardized interface includes means for instructing the message transport to perform actions (col 15, lines 29-40, col 19-22).

21. As per claim 23, Multer discloses the third standardized interface comprises a EMailSyncHandler interface (col 15, lines 29-40, col 19-22).

Conclusion

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent 6,343,318

U.S. PUB 2003/0200254

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A Siddiqi whose telephone number is (703) 305-0353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100